



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,180	06/20/2003	Robert Ya-Lin Pan	8980R2	9698
27752	7590	08/25/2004	EXAMINER	
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161 6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE CINCINNATI, OH 45224			OGDEN JR, NECHOLUS	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1751		

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<i>OL</i>
	10/600,180	PAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Necholus Ogden	1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/04;6/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 98/37866.

5. WO '866 teaches the following at page 6, lines 8-36:

The present invention relates to liquid skin cleansing compositions comprising:

- (1) any mild surfactant system (i.e., any one or more surfactants which alone or together are demonstrated by clinical tests to be milder than soap itself) in an amount of from about 1-99% by wt., preferably 2-85% by wt., more preferably 3-40% by wt. surfactant system;
- (2) 0.5 to about 9%, preferably 0.5 to 5% by weight of a hydroxy carboxylic compound or compounds (e.g., lactic acid) which alone or together buffer the pH of the liquid skin cleanser composition such that the pH is no higher than 5.5 under in-use conditions (i.e., 1:0.5 to 1:100 dilution, preferably 1:1 to 1:25 dilution of product in H₂O); and
- (3) 1% to 99% by wt., preferably 15 to 97%, most preferably 60 to 97% by wt. water.

More specifically, the composition may comprise:

- (1) 1% to 99% by wt. of surfactant system comprising:
 - (a) 1 to 30% by wt. of at least one anionic surfactant;
 - (b) 0.5% to 15% amphoteric surfactant;
- (2) 0.5 to 9% hydroxy acid; and
- (3) 1% to 99% water.

WO '866 is silent with respect to the pKa of the composition, however, it would have been obvious to the skill artisan to expect the compositions of WO '866 to encompass the pKa of the claimed invention because each of the components are taught and required in their requisite proportions wherein one of ordinary skill in the absence a showing to the contrary would expect the compositions to encompass the pKa of the claimed invention.

6. Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeer (5653970).

Vermeer teaches the following:

Vermeer (US 5653970). Vermeer teaches a cleansing composition comprising an alkyl aldonamide, anionic surfactant (Col. 15, line 15 – Col. 21, line 55), skin-conditioning agents such as fatty alcohols and polyols (Col. 30, line 43 – Col. 34, line 31), sequestering agents such EDTA (Col. 40, lines 30-56), antimicrobial agents (Col. 40, line 66 – Col. 41, line 22), pH-control agents (acids) (Col. 41, lines 34-45), oils (mineral oil, silicones) (Col. 31, lines 56-65; Col. 33, lines 30-51) and complexing agents (additional acids) (Col. 42, lines 16-25). The compositions can be in various personal care compositions/products (Col. 46, line 40 – Col. 47, line 4). It is the position of the Examiner that the particular final product that includes the cleansing composition is not critical, absent a clear showing of criticality. The references teaches many different personal care composition can be incorporate the above stated cleansing/care composition.

Vermeer is silent with respect to the concentration of the components, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the components in obvious concentrations absent a showing to the contrary. It has been held that when general conditions of the claims are met it is not patentable to discover optimum or workable ranges. *In re Aller* 105 USPQ 233.

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply 37 CFR 3.73(b).

with

8. Claims 1-37 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-39 and 1-47 of copending Application No. 09/177,445 and 10/263,211, respectively. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: anionic surfactants with carboxylic acid components in acid formulation for use within cleansing compositions.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Necholus Ogden whose telephone number is 571-272-1322. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T and Th-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on 571-272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Necholus Ogden
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

No
8-21-04